

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending.

Claims 1-6 are rejected.

Claim 7 is cancelled.

Claim 1 is amended to correct the tense of the verbs of the claim.

No new matter was entered in view of these amendments.

Rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Rejection of Claims 1 and 4-6

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perrot (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20060156362 A1) in view of Djupsjobacka et al. (US 20030022643 A1). Applicants disagree with this ground of rejection.

The Office Action recites that US 20060156362, herein after Perrot, discloses the steps of claim 1 with the exception that Perrot does not teach the networks information is a Network Information Table (NIT) and a Service Description Table (SDT).

The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Applicants submit that some of the steps of the invention as claimed by claim 1 are not disclosed by Perrot for the reasons that will be explained further on.

In addition, the Office Action asserts that Perrot, at paragraph 0039 lines 1-4, discloses a step of:

“the terminal extracts from the said stream at least the networks information”.

Paragraph 0039, lines 1-4 recite:

“The STB 303 receives the XML textual files, extracts the discovery information and uses the discovery information to select a transport stream and to determine the localization at which the transport stream is IP multicast.”

In the cited passage Perrot describes that a Set Top Box receives XML files and extracts discovery information, which is used by the terminal to determine the IP multicast localization of a transport stream and to select it. In no way, the cited passage discloses extraction of network information from a stream. Rather, Perrot describes extraction of discovery information from a textual file. According to Perrot’s method of broadcasting an offer of multimedia services over an IP network, MSO’s provide MPEG-2 transport streams to an IP delivery operator such as an ISP, see [0035] lines 10-11: *“The MSO provides the MPEG-2 transport streams to an IP delivery network operator such as for example an ISP”* and MSO’s generate discovery information that is needed at the receiver side, see [0038] lines 1-2 *“The MSOs generate discovery information needed at the receiver side”* and then these MSOs insert the discovery information into textual files eg. XML files. These XML files are then IP multicast on the IP broadband network. See [0038] lines 7-9 *“The discovery information is inserted into one or many textual files, eg into the well known XML textual file format, and IP multicast on the IP broadband network”*. It is clear that in Perrot’s method of transmission, the multimedia services and the discovery information are transmitted separately, the first in a transport stream, the second in XML files. This is further clarified by paragraph [0039] lines 1-4 where Perrot mentions that an STB receives separate transport streams and XML textual files:

“The STB 303 receives the XML textual files, extracts the discovery information and uses the discovery information to select a transport stream and to determine the localization at which the transport stream is multicast”

In no way, Perrot discloses or suggests that “the terminal extracts from the said stream at least the Networks Information Table”, where “said stream” is a transport stream, as is claimed by claim 1.

Thus Perrot does at least not disclose the feature of claim 1 of “the terminal extracts from the said stream at least the Networks Information Table”, let alone that Perrot discloses or suggests that the Networks Information Table is extracted from a transport stream transmitted to an IP address on a port as is claimed by the first step of claim 1.

These features are also not disclosed by Djupsjobacka. The Office Action recites that Djupsjobacka teaches use of NIT and SDT tables in DVB transmissions in an IP type network.

The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Office action recites figs 3a-3c and paragraphs 0039, 0040, 0041 and 0059. Figs 3a-3c and paragraphs 0039, 0040 and 0041 merely describe prior-art organization and hierarchy of service information (DVB-SI, paragraph [0039]), comprising a NIT (paragraph [0040]) and an SDT ([0041]). Paragraph [0059] merely describes retrieving a data transmission stream of a service from a name-based address file. None of the paragraphs cited by the Examiner disclose or suggest DVB transmission in an IP environment, let alone that these paragraphs disclose or suggest the use of NIT and SDT tables in DVB transmission in an IP environment.

In fact, Djupsjobacka is not at all related to DVB transmission in an IP type network. Rather, Djupsjobacka clearly mentions in paragraphs [0036 - 0038] that Djupsjobacka is related to classical data transmission per satellite or cable television network. That Djupsjobacka is not about transmission of transport streams over an IP type network, is further clear from [0059], where it is mentioned that carrier frequency and symbol-rate are retrieved from a NIT table, which are parameters that are typically related to transmission over radio waves, not to transmission of transport streams over IP:

*“The following is a description on retrieving the data transmission stream of a service from the name-based address file 28, with reference to FIG. 6. The address file 28 is used for retrieving the service-provider_name and the service_name. These operations are indicated in FIG. 6 with arrows 6/1 and 6/2, respectively. On the basis of this name information, a search is made in service description tables SDT for the information of such a service, in whose description said names are found. When the record describing said service is found, the original_network_id and the transport_stream_id are retrieved from the field of the SDT table. On the basis of the original network id and the transport_stream_id, a record is retrieved in the network information table NIT in which the transport_stream_id and the original_network_id match (arrow 6/3). **Next, the physical parameters of the data transmission stream, such as carrier frequency and symbol rate, are retrieved from the NIT table on the basis of the parameters contained in the found record.** On the basis of this information, the STB device 7 is tuned to receive the data transmission stream. From the PAT table of this data transmission stream, a record is retrieved in which the program_number is identical with the service_id contained in the record of the SDT table (arrows 6/4 and 6/5). When the correct service_id is found, the program_map_PID and program_number contained in the record of the PAT table of the program is used for finding out the correct field in the PMT table (arrows 6/6 and 6/7a). “*

Nowhere Djupsjobacka discloses or suggests “the terminal extracts from the said stream at least the Networks Information Table (NIT)”, where “said stream” is “a transport stream transmitted to said first IP address and on said first port” as is claimed by the second and first steps of claim 1.

At least the above mentioned features of the invention as claimed by claim 1 that are not disclosed by Perrot and that are also not disclosed by Djupsjobacka :

“a transport stream transmitted to said first IP address and on said first port” and

“the terminal extracts from the said stream at least the Networks Information Table (NIT)”

are also not disclosed by Cao (US 2004/0187161). Rather, according to Cao, paragraph 47 lines 1-2, a NIT is “encapsulated in a UDP packet” and not, as is claimed by claim 1, extracted from a transport stream that is transmitted to an IP address.

At least the above mentioned features of the invention as claimed by claim 1 that are not disclosed by Perrot and that are also not disclosed by Djupsjobacka and that are also not disclosed by Cao are also not disclosed by US 7,386,879 (Van Willigen). Van Willigen merely describes a broadcast network in which authorization and authentication for multiple services is possible. Van Willigen is rather far from the invention.

As has been shown, none of the documents cited by the Office Action does disclose or suggest all of the subject-matter of claim 1, since at least the feature of “a transport stream transmitted to said first IP address and on said first port” and “the terminal extracts from the said stream at least the Networks Information Table (NIT)” are not disclosed in any of the cited documents.

Therefore, the skilled in the art would not implement a method of discovery as claimed by claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 4 and 5 depend on allowable claim 1. The Applicants submit that these claims are therefore also allowable.

Apparatus claim 6 comprises similar limitations as allowable method claim 1 in terms of means and the Applicants submit that claim 6 is therefore also in condition for allowance.

Rejection of Claim 2

The Examiner rejected Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perrot and Djupsjobacka in further view of Cao. The Applicants submit that claim 2 is allowable as this claim depends on allowable claim 1.

Rejection of Claim 3

The Examiner rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perrot and Djupsjobacka in further view of Van Willigen. The Applicants submit that claim 3 is allowable as this claim depends on allowable claim 1.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,
R. Schaefer et al.

By: /Joel M. Fogelson/
Joel M. Fogelson
Reg. No. 43,613
Tel. No. (609) 734-6809

Thomson Licensing, LLC
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
January 21, 2010